



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,003	12/30/2003	Ingo Zenz	6570P016	9941
45062	7590	11/16/2007	EXAMINER	
SAP/BLAKELY 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			MORRISON, JAY A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2168		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		11/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

86

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,003	ZENZ, INGO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jay A. Morrison	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6,8-10,16-21,23-26 and 28-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-10,16-21,23-26 and 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Claims 1-6,8-10,16-21,23-26,28-31 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: what constitutes a conflict between a custom and default parameter, and what happens if a conflict occurs.

4. Claims 19 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: how selectively updating is done by comparing the default parameters, what results if based on the results of the comparison; in other words it is inferred that the updating might not take place based on the comparison but it is not clear when the updates does or does not occur.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Patrizio et al. ('Patrizio' hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,047,497) in view of Lakkapragada et al. ('Lakkapragada' hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,165,189).

As per claim 29, Patrizio teaches

A system comprising: (see abstract and background)

a central storage node, the central storage node including a configuration data structure, the configuration data structure comprising a global configuration module and a sub-cluster configuration module. (hierarchical map of objects including clusters node and interrelations, column 3, lines 38-44)

Patrizio does not explicitly indicate "the central storage node to send information included in the configuration data structure to a node within a sub-cluster in response to a request from the node".

However, Lakkapragada discloses "the central storage node to send information included in the configuration data structure to a node within a sub-cluster in response to a request from the node" (querying cluster to obtain configuration information, column 15, lines 5-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Patrizio and Lakkapragada because using the steps of "the central storage node to send information included in the configuration data structure to a node within a sub-cluster in response to a request from the node" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing components in a cluster system to be properly tested. This gives the user the advantage of being assured of cluster reliability.

As per claim 30, Patrizio teaches

the global configuration module comprising a dispatcher configuration module and a server configuration module. (column 3, lines 35-40)

As per claim 31, Patrizio teaches

the sub-cluster configuration module comprising a local configuration information associated with a sub-cluster, the local configuration information comprising a dispatcher module and a plurality of server modules, the dispatcher module including configuration information associated with a dispatcher node of the sub-cluster, and each of the plurality of server modules including configuration information associated with each server node of the sub-cluster. (column 3, lines 52-62)

7. Claims 1-2,16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Patrizio et

al. ('Patrizio' hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,047,497) and further in view of Lakkapragada et al. ('Lakkapragada' hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,165,189).

As per claim 1, Rubert teaches

A property sheet system comprising: (see abstract and background)
“including a plurality of property names, a plurality of non-modifiable parameters and a plurality of modifiable parameters, wherein each respective property name included in the property sheet data structure is associated with a non-modifiable parameter and optionally a modifiable parameter; and a user interface to display contents of the property sheet data structure”, “the user interface to receive inputs to select and modify a parameter associated with the property sheet data structure” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “a configuration module representing configuration information of a node within a clustered system, the configuration module comprising any one of a binary file, the binary file to map a key name to a set of data, a sub-configuration entry comprising an object of the code, or a name-value pair, the name-value pair to map a key name to an object, and a property sheet data structure representing configuration information associated with at least one component within the clustered system”, “to allow centralized management of the clustered system”.

However, Patrizio discloses “a configuration module representing configuration information of a node within a clustered system, the configuration module comprising any one of a binary file, the binary file to map a key name to a set of data, a sub-

configuration entry comprising an object of the code, or a name-value pair, the name-value pair to map a key name to an object, and a property sheet data structure representing configuration information associated with at least one component within the clustered system", "to allow centralized management of the clustered system" (selecting node in cluster where the node table is populated, column 4, lines 30-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Patrizio because using the steps of "a configuration module representing configuration information of a node within a clustered system, the configuration module comprising any one of a binary file, the binary file to map a key name to a set of data, a sub-configuration entry comprising an object of the code, or a name-value pair, the name-value pair to map a key name to an object, and a property sheet data structure representing configuration information associated with at least one component within the clustered system", "to allow centralized management of the clustered system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Patrizio explicitly indicate "and to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system".

However, Lakkapragada discloses "and to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the

clustered system" (querying cluster to obtain configuration information, column 15, lines 5-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rubert, Patrizio and Lakkapragada because using the steps of "and to manage configuration information of at least one dispatcher node that distributes requests to a plurality of nodes of the clustered system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing components in a cluster system to be properly tested. This gives the user the advantage of being assured of cluster reliability.

As per claim 2,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "the property sheet data structure is associated with a plurality of components contained within a clustered system".

However, Patrizio discloses "the property sheet data structure is associated with a plurality of components contained within a clustered system" (column 4, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Patrizio because using the steps of "the property sheet data structure is associated with a plurality of components contained within a clustered system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

As per claim 16, Rubert teaches

A method comprising:" (see abstract and background)
"displaying contents of the property sheet, the property sheet including non-modifiable parameters and modifiable parameters; and receiving input to select and modify a parameter of the displayed property sheet" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "providing a configuration module of a node contained within a cluster, the module comprising any one of a binary file, a sub-configuration entry, or a name-value pair, and a property sheet containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a cluster".

However, Patrizio discloses "providing a configuration module of a node contained within a cluster, the module comprising any one of a binary file, a sub-configuration entry, or a name-value pair, and a property sheet containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a cluster" (selecting node in cluster where the node table is populated, column 4, lines 30-50);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Patrizio because using the steps of "providing a configuration module of a node contained within a cluster, the module comprising any one of a binary file, a sub-configuration entry, or a name-value pair, and a property sheet containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a cluster" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available

and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Patrizio does not explicitly indicate "and sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node".

However, Lakkapragada discloses "and sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node" (querying cluster to obtain configuration information, column 15, lines 5-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rubert, Patrizio and Lakkapragada because using the steps of "and sending the configuration information to the node in response to a request from the node" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing components in a cluster system to be properly tested. This gives the user the advantage of being assured of cluster reliability.

As per claim 17, Rubert teaches

"the displaying contents of a property sheet comprises: providing a number of entry rows; displaying names of corresponding properties in a first column of each entry row; displaying configuration parameters associated with corresponding properties in a second column of each entry row; and indicating if a configuration parameter displayed in the second column is a default parameter or a custom parameter" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 18,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster".

However, Patrizio discloses "the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster" (column 4, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Patrizio because using the steps of "the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

8. Claims 6,8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Gudjonsson et al. ('Gudjonsson' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,564,261) and further in view of Tran et al. ('Tran' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,658,018).

As per claim 6, Rubert teaches

"A method comprising:" (see abstract and background)

"providing a property sheet", "the property sheet including a plurality of configuration parameters, each parameter associated with a name, a default parameter and a custom parameter", "default parameters" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6);

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "associated with a component contained within a clustered system", "replacing the component contained within the clustered system; and automatically updating the ... parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component in response to replacing the component".

However, Gudjonsson discloses "associated with a component contained within a clustered system", "replacing the component contained within the clustered system; and automatically updating the ... parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component in response to replacing the component" (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of "associated with a component contained within a clustered system", "replacing the component contained within the clustered system; and automatically updating the ... parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component in response to replacing the component" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and

configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson explicitly indicate "and determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement component."

However, Tran discloses "and determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement component" (compare replacement attributes to team adapter attributes, column 4, lines 33-38 and column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson and Tran because using the steps of "and determining a conflict between each custom parameter included in the property sheet with the different default parameter of the corresponding property of the replacement component" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by having more control of over replacement parameters to help ensure smooth configuration updates. This gives the user the advantage of assurance of better reliability.

As per claim 8, Rubert teaches

"determining if a custom parameter included in the property sheet is valid with the replaced component" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 9, Rubert teaches

"deselecting the custom parameter in response to the custom parameter being not valid with the replaced component" (column 6, lines 1-6).

As per claim 10,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "the cluster includes a plurality of instances".

However, Gudjonsson discloses "the cluster includes a plurality of instances" (plurality of clusters, column 7, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of "the cluster includes a plurality of instances" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

9. Claims 19,26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Gudjonsson et al. ('Gudjonsson' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,564,261) and further in view of Block et al. ('Block' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,983,324) and further in view of Tran et al. ('Tran' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,658,018).

As per claim 19, Rubert teaches

"A system comprising:" (see abstract and background)

"means for displaying contents of a property sheet", "the property sheet having a plurality of properties, wherein each of said properties is associated with a property name, a non-modifiable default parameter and a custom parameter; and means for receiving input to select and modify a parameter associated with a property included in the property sheet" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a clustered system".

However, Gudjonsson discloses "containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a clustered system" (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of "containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a clustered system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson explicitly indicate "and means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component."

However, Block discloses "and means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component" (change cluster resource services and parameter modification, column 7, lines 52-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson and Block because using the steps of “and means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing a component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing reconfiguration without taking a node offline. This gives the user the advantage of having more uptime of resources.

Neither Rubert, Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate “by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component.”

However, Tran discloses “by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component” (compare replacement attributes to team adapter attributes, column 4, lines 33-38 and column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block, and Tran because using the steps of “by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by having more control of over replacement parameters to help ensure smooth configuration updates. This gives the user the advantage of assurance of better reliability.

As per claim 26, Rubert teaches

"A machine-readable medium that provides instructions, which when executed by a processor cause the processor to perform operations comprising:" (see abstract and background)

"displaying contents of a property sheet data structure", "the property sheet data structure including a plurality of property names, a plurality of non-modifiable default parameters and a plurality of custom parameters; receiving input to select a custom parameter included in the property sheet data structure; receiving input to modify the selected custom parameter; and storing the modified custom parameter without changing a default parameter corresponding to the modified custom parameter" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system".

However, Gudjonsson discloses "representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system" (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of "representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson explicitly indicate "and selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing of a component."

However, Block discloses "and selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing of a component" (change cluster resource services and parameter modification, column 7, lines 52-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson and Block because using the steps of "and selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to replacing of a component" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing reconfiguration without taking a node offline. This gives the user the advantage of having more uptime of resources.

Neither Rubert, Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate "by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component."

However, Tran discloses "by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component" (compare replacement attributes to team adapter attributes, column 4, lines 33-38 and column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block, and Tran because using the steps of "by comparing each default parameter of the component to be replaced with a corresponding default parameter of a replacement component" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve

the invention by having more control of over replacement parameters to help ensure smooth configuration updates. This gives the user the advantage of assurance of better reliability.

10. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Patrizio et al. ('Patrizio' hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,047,497) and further in view of Lakkapragada et al. ('Lakkapragada' hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,165,189) and further in view of Tanner et al. ('Tanner' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2005/0114315).

As per claim 3,

Neither Rubert, Patrizio nor Lakkapragada explicitly indicate "the user interface comprises: a first dialog box to display contents of the property sheet data structure, the first dialog box including a plurality of entry rows, the entry rows including a first column to display names of corresponding properties, a second column to display configuration parameters associated with the corresponding properties and a third column to indicate if the configuration parameters are default or custom parameters; and a second dialog box to receive input to modify a custom parameter".

However, Tanner discloses "the user interface comprises: a first dialog box to display contents of the property sheet data structure, the first dialog box including a plurality of entry rows, the entry rows including a first column to display names of corresponding properties, a second column to display configuration parameters

associated with the corresponding properties and a third column to indicate if the configuration parameters are default or custom parameters; and a second dialog box to receive input to modify a custom parameter" (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Patrizio, Lakkapragada and Tanner because using the steps of "the user interface comprises: a first dialog box to display contents of the property sheet data structure, the first dialog box including a plurality of entry rows, the entry rows including a first column to display names of corresponding properties, a second column to display configuration parameters associated with the corresponding properties and a third column to indicate if the configuration parameters are default or custom parameters; and a second dialog box to receive input to modify a custom parameter" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 4,

Neither Rubert, Patrizio nor Lakkapragada explicitly indicate "the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property".

However, Tanner discloses "the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default

configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property" (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Patrizio, Lakkapragada and Tanner because using the steps of "the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 5,

Neither Rubert, Patrizio nor Lakkapragada explicitly indicate "the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property".

However, Tanner discloses "the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property" (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Patrizio, Lakkapragada and Tanner because using the steps of "the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by

avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

11. Claims 20-21,23-25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Gudjonsson et al. ('Gudjonsson' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,564,261) further in view of Block et al. ('Block' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,983,324) and further in view of Tran et al. ('Tran' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,658,018) and further in view of Tanner et al. ('Tanner' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2005/0114315).

As per claim 20,

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate "means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet".

However, Tanner discloses "means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet" (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block and Tanner because using the steps of "means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet" would have given those skilled in the art the

tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 21, Rubert teaches

"the means for displaying further comprises: means for indicating if a configuration parameter displayed by the means for displaying is a default parameter or a custom parameter" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 22,

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate "means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to changing of a component".

However, Tanner discloses "means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to changing of a component" (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block and Tanner because using the steps of "means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to changing of a component" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 23,

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate "means for automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component".

However, Tanner discloses "means for automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component" (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block and Tanner because using the steps of "means for automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 24, Rubert teaches

"means for determining if a custom parameter included in the property sheet is valid with the replaced component" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 25, Rubert teaches

"means for deselecting a custom parameter in response to the custom parameter being not valid with the replaced component" (column 6, lines 1-6).

As per claim 28, Rubert teaches

"determining a custom parameter included in the property sheet data structure is valid with the replaced component" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6);

"and deselecting an applied custom parameter in response to the applied custom parameter being not valid with the replaced component" (column 6, lines 1-6).

Neither Rubert nor Gudjonsson nor Block explicitly indicate "the operations performed by the processor further comprise: automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet data structure with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component".

However, Tanner discloses "the operations performed by the processor further comprise: automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet data structure with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component" (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert, Gudjonsson, Block and Tanner because using the steps of "the operations performed by the processor further comprise: automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet data structure with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the replaced component" would have given those skilled in

the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6,8-10,16-21,23-26,28-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100

Application/Control Number: 10/750,003

Art Unit: 2168

Page 27